

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herewith, which place the application into condition for allowance. The present amendment is being made to facilitate prosecution of the application.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS

Claims 1-23 are pending in this application. Claim 23 is hereby added. Claims 1, 11, and 23 are independent. Claims 1, 11, and 23 are hereby amended. It is submitted that these claims, as originally presented, were in full compliance with the requirements 35 U.S.C. §112. No new matter has been introduced by this amendment. Support for this amendment is provided throughout the specification. Changes to claims are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103, or §112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which the Applicants are entitled.

II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1, 2, 6, 11-13, 19, and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,133,909 to Schein, et al (hereinafter, merely "Schein").

III. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 3, 8-10, and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,133,909 to Schein et al. in view of U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0014753 to Beach et al.

Claims 4 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,133,909 to Schein et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,966,637 to Kanungo et al.

Claims 5 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,133,909 to Schein et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,404,507 to Bohm et al.

Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,133,909 to Schein et al. in view of U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0014753 to Beach et al. and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,598,039 to Livowsky et al.

Claim 15 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,133,909 to Schein et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,598,039 to Livowsky et al.

Claim 18 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,133,909 to Schein et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,463,428 to Lee et al.

Claims 21 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,133,909 to Schein et al.

IV. RESPONSE TO REJECTIONS

Claim 1 now recites, *inter alia*:

“...receiving an input retrieval keyword from a client side;

accessing a dictionary database based on an input retrieval keyword;

when receiving the input retrieval keyword, extracting relevant-keyword information relevant to said input retrieval keyword from one of a plurality of dictionaries by the dictionary database;

accessing an electronic-program-guide database that stores electronic-program-guide data based on the input retrieval keyword and the extracted relevant-keyword information relevant to said input retrieval keyword; and

downloading only electronic-program-guide data based on the extracted relevant-keyword information from the electronic-program-guide data stored in said electronic-program-guide database and the input retrieval keyword.”
(Emphasis Added)

As understood by Applicants, Schein relates to a method and apparatus for searching a guide and using a user's input of desired program characteristics to identify particular programs that may be of interest to the user. The apparatus also asks a user questions that aid identifying desired characteristics of a favorite program and then uses those responses to find other programs that may be of interest. Additionally, when a user is watching a program, the apparatus stores additional programs that may be of interest to the user based upon the program being watched.

Applicants submit that the cited portions of Schein disclose using a user's input to directly search and extract Electronic Program Data. Specifically, Column 12, line 66 to Column 13, line 20 discloses a user selecting a preference or preferences, and the system searching the available program guide for those preferences. The user can also select a specific subcategory of

the available program guide, such as actors or theme, and again input a preference or preferences. The system merely searches that sub-guide for the user's preference.

Furthermore, column 13, lines 33-48 of Schein discloses a two step searching process. A user inputs one keyword and the system searches the available data. The results are displayed to the user, who then further refines the search.

Applicants submit that nothing has been found in Schein that discloses or suggests the above-identified features of amended independent claim 1. Specifically, Schein does not disclose receiving an input retrieval keyword from a client side, accessing a dictionary database based on an input retrieval keyword, when receiving the input retrieval keyword, extracting relevant-keyword information relevant to said input retrieval keyword from one of a plurality of dictionaries by the dictionary database, accessing an electronic-program-guide database that stores electronic-program-guide data based on the input retrieval keyword and the extracted relevant-keyword information relevant to said input retrieval keyword, and downloading only electronic-program-guide data based on the extracted relevant-keyword information from the electronic-program-guide data stored in said electronic-program-guide database and the input retrieval keyword, as recited in claim 1.

Therefore, claim 1 is patentable.

For reasons similar to those described above, amended independent claim 11 is patentable.

Claim 23 recites, *inter alia*:

“a data server including a plurality of databases, one of which is a television electronic-program-guide database for storing program information of an electronic program guide containing only keywords determined by an EPG provider as retrieval keywords;

a client having a certain data storage capacity comprising input means for inputting a retrieval keyword for retrieving the program information;

a plurality of dictionary databases provided at the data server side and the client side for storing retrieval keywords and relevant keywords relevant to said retrieval keywords; and

a routing server having an access unit for accessing selectively said database and route information,

wherein when retrieval keyword is input, and relevant-keyword information relevant to the retrieval keyword input by said client is extracted from said dictionary database provided at the client side, said client sends the relevant-keyword to said routing server and accesses one of the databases of said data server via said routing server storing information on routes to the parts of said data server, and said routing server accesses the database by selecting the route to the database so that retrieval by accessing the program information is performed based on the extracted relevant-keyword information and the input retrieval keyword, and

wherein an apparatus including an access unit for accessing said data server and an input unit for inputting a retrieval keyword, can perform retrieval on the EPG data by using relevant keywords extracted from said dictionary database at the server side.”

Applicants submit that none of the art made of record discloses the above-identified features of claim 23. Therefore, claim 23 is patentable.

As understood by Applicants, the other art made of record does not add any disclosure that would render claim 1 or 11 unpatentable.

V. DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION


In the event the Examiner disagrees with any of statements appearing above with respect to the disclosure in the cited references, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate the portion, or portions, of the reference providing the basis for a contrary view.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable and Applicant respectfully requests early passage to issue of the present application.

Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicants

By 
Thomas F. Presson
Reg. No. 41,442
(212) 588-0800